Remarks

1. Oath/Declaration

The Office Action stated that the file Oath/Declaration was defective. The filed

Oath/Declaration states:

> "I believe I am the original and first inventor ... or an original and joint inventor ...
> of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the
> invention..."

Applicants will promptly file a new Oath/Declaration but do not understand the defect of

the language above and respectfully request clarification.

2. Drawings

Applicant is submitting replacement sheets for FIGs. 4B, 5, and 1A. FIG. 4B has been

corrected to remove reference number 305b. FIG. 5 has been corrected to remove

reference number 328. FIG. 1A has been corrected to indicate the shaded elements

identified in paragraph [0013] of the specification. No new matter has been added.

3. Title

Applicant has amended the title.

4. Trademarks

Applicant has amended paragraphs [0034] and [0039].

5. Claims.

A. Status

Claims 1-23 remain pending with claims 1 and 12 being independent. Applicants have cancelled claims 24-29.

B. Claim Objections

Applicant has amended the claims 1, 2, and 12 to recite a "processor" instead of a "multi-tasking processor"

Applicant has amended claim 18 to depend on claim 12.

C. Claim Rejections under s. 112

Applicant has amended claims 11 and 22 to correct antecedent basis for the limitation "the engine".

D. Claim Rejections under s. 101

Applicant has amended claim 12, and correspondingly amended claims 13-23, to recite "a computer readable medium storing instructions".

E. Claim Rejections under s. 102

The Office Action rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Dubey (U.S. 5,812,811). In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the instruction being inserted is an instruction to cause a processor to perform a thread context swap and that the insertion of the instruction is based on counts of consecutively executed instructions of

the second thread that do not instruct the processor to perform a context swap to

another thread.   Applicants do not understand Dubey to disclose context swapping

either in name or in operation, let alone inserting instructions that cause context

swapping based on counts of consecutively executed instructions that do not instruct

the processor to perform a context swap to another thread. Applicant thus request

withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims for at

least this reason.   Claim 12 has been similarly amended and Applicants also request

withdrawal of the rejections of claim 12 and its corresponding dependent claims for at

least the same reason.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:___7/25/2007_____   /Robert A. Greenberg/_____
                                    Robert A. Greenberg
                                    Reg. No. 44,133

c/o BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
    12400 Wilshire Blvd.
    Seventh Floor
    Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
    (503) 684-6200